DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 739 PS 027 942

AUTHOR	Lund, Louisa
TITLE	Eight Themes in Comprehensive Community Development: An Annotated Bibliography.
INSTITUTION	Harvard Family Research Project, Cambridge, MA.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, NY.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	33p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Harvard Family Research Project, 38 Concord Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138 ($7). Tel: 617-495-9108; Fax: 617-495-8594; e-mail: hfrp@hugse1.harvard.edu; Web site: http://hugse1.harvard.edu/~hfrp
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Annotated Bibliographies; *Community Development; Community Role; *Family Programs; Family Role; *Public Policy

ABSTRACT

The bibliography is aimed at managers of programs forging links between family support and community development. The bibliography begins with a brief explanation of the eight organizing themes: (1) supporting families; (2) focusing on youth; (3) building unity from diversity; (4) thinking in terms of assets; (5) seeing the big picture; (6) working collaboratively; (7) balancing process and product; and (7) drawing on multiple sources of funding. The annotations of 56 individual recent sources (government reports, periodical articles, and research reports published between 1991 and 1998) are then presented, sorted into a general resources category or the eight thematic categories listed above. Some entries appear in more than one category. (DLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 434 739

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

EIGHT THEMES IN COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

An Annotated Bibliography

Louisa Lund

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ann B. Hannum
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2B

Harvard Family Research Project
Cambridge, MA
1998

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PS 027942

EIGHT THEMES IN COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

An Annotated Bibliography

Louisa Lund

Harvard Family Research Project
Cambridge, MA
1998

This project was supported by generous grants from the Ford Foundation . The contents of this publication are solely the responsibility of the Harvard Family Research Project.

HARVARD FAMILY RESEARCH PROJECT

Founded in 1983 by Dr. Heather Weiss, the Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP) is today at the center of a national movement to strengthen and support American families. HFRP's pathbreaking research provides practitioners, researchers, and policymakers with timely, insightful information about effective family support initiatives.

Disseminating its research widely, HFRP links people, programs, ideas, and resources together to create innovative family support programs and services and family-sustaining policies. HFRP's research helps states create systems to monitor and assess programs and services, and helps communities better integrate family support services in neighborhood programs. Using HFRP data, schools are learning more about the specific benefits of parent involvement and the best strategies for successfully engaging the entire family. HFRP's research findings are enabling practitioners to design culturally appropriate programs, and helping training and education programs effectively prepare teachers to work with families.

Harvard Family Research Project

38 Concord Avenue

Cambridge, MA 02138

Tel.: (617) 495-9108

Fax: (617) 495-8594

e-mail: hfrp@hugse1.harvard.edu

Web Site: http://hugse1.harvard.edu/~hfrp

© 1998 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College (Harvard Family Research Project). All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any way without the written permission of the Harvard Family Research Project. The contents of this publication are solely the responsibility of the Harvard Family Research Project and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its funders. Published in 1998. Printed in the United States of America.

PREFACE

This paper is intended to serve as a resource for those with an interest in forging closer links between family support and community development. Those engaged in managing and directing programs in these areas will gain insights into the common ground and the potential for collaboration that exists between the practices of family support and community development. As a review of current literature, this paper represents one part of a larger study of the intersection of family support and community development. The second part of this study (to be published separately) presents the results of a series of interviews with practitioners about the ways in which family support has become integrated with community development in their programs. The third part examines the evaluation of community-based initiatives and is published in the Harvard Family Research Project's quarterly newsletter, *The Evaluation Exchange*, Volume II, Number 4 1996, and Volume III, Number 3, 1997.

What follows is a brief introduction to one way of organizing the literature on community development. Much of the research focuses on eight core practices or recurring themes:

1. Supporting families
2. Focusing on youth
3. Building unity from diversity
4. Thinking in terms of assets
5. Seeing the big picture
6. Working collaboratively
7. Balancing "process" and "product"
8. Drawing on multiple sources of funding

The introduction to this review gives a brief explanation of what is meant by each "core practice," why it is important, and what special challenges it raises for community development practitioners.

An annotated bibliography of recent selected sources then follows. The sources are organized in groups according to their usefulness as general resources or their specific relevance to one of the eight practices listed above and discussed in greater detail below.

The following people contributed valuable comments to this report: Mary Jo Mullen (The F. B. Heron Foundation), Jack Litzenberg (Charles Stewart Mott Foundation), Debbie Visser (Neighborhood Funders Group), and Cami Anderson, Karen Horsch, and Elena Lopez (HFRP).

Louisa Lund
1998

EIGHT THEMES
IN
COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

> It is difficult to force a man out of himself and get him to take an interest in the affairs of the whole state, for he has little understanding of the way in which the fate of the state can influence his own lot. But if it is a question of taking a road past his property, he sees at once that this small public matter has a bearing on his greatest private interests, and there is no need to point out to him the close connection between his private profit and the general interest. (Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*)

In his *Democracy in America*, Alexis de Tocqueville argued that local politics is central to American democracy. Today, the health of American democracy seems to many to be in jeopardy. Voting rates are down, as are levels of trust in the government and in other people. As American citizens spend less and less time in community activities, Robert Putnam informs us that "social capital," or the network of connections among citizens that makes effective democracy possible, is in decline.

American policy toward impoverished neighborhoods is influenced by this climate of concern. The devolution of welfare policy to state and local governments can be understood in part as a reassertion of the old ideal of local government in response to what seems like the intractability of the problems of poor urban communities. From a different angle, the President's April 1997 summit encouraging "volunteerism" calls for a return to face-to-face social service, building a larger sense of American community.

The comprehensive community development movement addresses one of the central questions that these concerns raise: How can communities work together to improve their neighborhoods and the lives of their residents?

The basic premise of a comprehensive approach is that people and communities are influenced by a complex web of factors, so that any real change in their prospects and in the health of the community will result only from interventions that touch many aspects of residents' lives at once. A comprehensive view looks at neighborhoods as ecosystems, interconnected webs in which the flourishing of the whole depends on the health of each part. It looks for the connections between a neighborhood's physical well-being, the existence of a strong community, and the well-being of individuals in the neighborhood. In the old tradition of settlement houses, accordingly, comprehensive approaches to community-building consider not only housing, but how to develop a sense of community

within housing; not only education, but how to provide for the needs of youth for fun and recreation; not only jobs, but how to help people meet their needs for transportation, child care, etc., which will allow them to meet the demands of employment.

This approach contrasts sharply with the piecemeal approach of most government programs, which target only certain groups (for instance, the unemployed) and often focus on only one problem these individuals may be facing, rather than looking at the whole picture of the situation of individuals within a neighborhood. Such a fragmented approach may be ineffective, or worse yet, counterproductive. Efforts in one area — for example, building skills for individuals — might actually undermine work in other areas: If skilled people leave the neighborhood, then the neighborhood itself might not improve. In contrast, comprehensive development pursues three simultaneous goals: individual empowerment, neighborhood development, and political action. The comprehensive approach encourages community development organizations to focus on policies that will have a positive impact on all three areas, creating a "cycle of benefits."

THEMES IN COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

1. SUPPORTING FAMILIES

***Distinctive features of community-based family support*:**

"Community-based family support" describes a way of working with families and children which differs in important respects from more traditional family services. These programs take an ecological view of families — good parenting is understood, not as a skill practiced or neglected by isolated individuals, but as facilitated or frustrated by the economic and social environments in which parents find themselves. Good parents are not born; they are developed and nurtured by supportive communities, and their development can be stunted by such factors as economic insecurity or social isolation. Community-based family support aims to develop self-sufficient and caring families who support each other's parenting efforts and goals for personal development.

Family support programs take a variety of forms in connection with other aspects of community development, from informal parenting groups to formal programs that aid families in difficulties. All of them, however, take a proactive, broad-based approach to helping families, emphasizing accessibility and partnership, and working simultaneously to promote the well-being of families and of the individuals within them, on the assumption that these two things go together.

***Why family support is part of comprehensive community development*:**

Strong families make strong communities. Many families, however, are challenged by the stresses of balancing the multiple demands of work and family life. Through family support activities, parents gain access to peer group support and respite, parenting information and guidance, and access to specialized services when needed. These supports enhance a family's ability to carry out its childrearing functions. They also provide a forum where families can act collectively on community issues — such as affordable, quality child care or after-school programs — that influence children's development.

***Challenges of comprehensive family support*:**

Because the practice of "family support" is different from the fragmented approach of traditional social services, attempts to implement family support programs call for innovative problem solving in coordinating a range of programs to form a coherent whole, and in finding funding for what may seem to more traditionally-minded social service providers as services not directly relevant to the specific problems of individuals.

Furthermore, family support is based on working with family strengths and on the idea that helping individual family members will in turn strengthen families. This

approach may need to be balanced by maintaining a willingness to recognize those situations in which the well-being of children may be at odds with family child-raising practices. One of the challenges of family support programs lies in striking a balance between the respect for diversity and focus on family capabilities that is at the heart of family support, and the possible need for intervention to protect the best interests of children.

2. FOCUSING ON YOUTH

Understanding a "focus on youth":

Community programs that focus on youth may take a number of forms, from employment and training to recreation. Such programs may aim to serve youth and to engage them as stakeholders in the process of governance. These programs may also seek to help youth realize their potential as assets for the community by involving them in community development efforts such as housing renovation, working with young children, or providing services for the elderly.

Why youth are a vital part of community development:

The lives of young people are often centered on their neighborhoods and strongly influenced by what goes on there. In turn, young people themselves exert a significant influence on the tone of a community. To the extent that communities can help youth find constructive ways to spend their time and energies and engage them as stakeholders in community improvements, they may be able to reduce the damage to community spirit and safety posed by a range of issues from graffiti to youth involvement in crime or drugs. Furthermore, the future of community development efforts depends on cultivating leadership skills and commitment to the community in the next generation.

Challenges:

Many programs designed for youth fail to attract youth participation. There is no formula for successful programs for youth, but McLaughlin et al. (cited below) suggest a set of guidelines gathered from the experiences of successful programs. Their success seems to depend particularly on steadfast, sincere leadership willing and able to make the necessary commitment to create a trusting relationship with young people in the community. Beyond the success of individual programs, forming an important role for youth in community development presents a systemic challenge, with implications for how systems of governance are set up as well as for how youth are included in the whole range of community development activities.

3. BUILDING UNITY FROM DIVERSITY

***Elements of community and diversity*:**

"Community development," by definition, focuses its efforts on an area in which people have something in common — at the least, they live in the same geographical area. It works by trying to transform this shared location into a stronger bond of shared goals and experiences. However, this emphasis on building connections need not imply an insistence on homogeneity. All communities are diverse in some way, whether through racial, ethnic, class, or age differences. Furthermore, those who provide services to a community may be of a predominantly different race, class or ethnicity from many community residents. At the same time, community leaders may find themselves working with or seeking the support of outsiders who may also differ from those in the community.

***Why diversity should not be ignored*:**

Community development is most successful when it can engage the greatest possible number of community members as stakeholders, invested in the success of its efforts to transform the neighborhood. Ignoring diversity risks the exclusion of some members of the community from this process. At the same time, those who try to "serve" a diverse community without fully including it may find themselves working unproductively, perhaps because of language barriers or because of a failure to understand important cultural differences.

***Challenges of accommodating diversity*:**

Taking the claims of diversity seriously may raise some new challenges for community development, pointing to the importance of actively addressing the linguistic and cultural gulfs that may exist both within a community and between a community and the staff that becomes involved in community development efforts. Furthermore, while community development must aim to give members of the community a sense of ownership, it must also aim to retain a kind of flexibility that will allow for the admission of new members and new points of view to the process. The importance of building a sense of community will need to be balanced against the dangers of building a sense of community that excludes some community members.

4. THINKING IN TERMS OF ASSETS: THE IMPORTANCE OF SEEING THE GLASS AS HALF-FULL

Understanding Asset-based Community Development:

Asset-based community development makes drawing upon and developing the strengths and resources of neighborhoods, families, and individuals the core of community development efforts. This emphasis on community strengths and wealth building contrasts with older traditions of service provision, which have provided help only in response to documented needs and deficiencies in communities. These services have usually been only adequate enough to meet pressing and immediate needs — in effect, rewarding neighborhood dysfunctionality and lack of assets. In many instances, this has resulted in the perpetuation of poverty by focusing on stopgap income support measures rather than the long-term accumulation of a cushion of family and individual assets.

The first half of an assets-based approach begins as a simple shift in perspective. Instead of needs and deficiencies, the assets approach looks for community strengths and resources. Practitioners of this approach begin their planning process by making a "map" of neighborhood resources, which in turn suggests plans for how to use these resources for community development.

Advocates of this part of the assets model (John McKnight and John Kretzmann are leaders in this area) encourage a broad and generous approach to identifying assets in communities. Individuals, community associations, and local institutions are all possible resources for the community. In particular, the assets approach encourages planners to take a second look at the potential of groups that are often thought of primarily as clients — youth, or mothers on welfare, for instance — to serve as community resources. Similarly, apparent problems, such as vacant lots or uncollected garbage, can be recategorized as assets for those who need, for example, space to garden or an opportunity for a local business disposing of household trash. One example of this kind of thinking can be seen in some programs that train residents to become child care providers, simultaneously increasing employment in the neighborhood and developing a much-needed resource for other working mothers.

The second half of a focus on assets is an emphasis, not on the provision of short-term services, but on helping neighborhoods, families, and individuals develop their own capital, perhaps in the form of savings for education or an investment in owning a house. Individual Development Accounts (IDA's), administered by community organizations, are used to promote asset accumulation and encourage saving by supplementing and matching (usually several times over) individual deposits to these accounts. Account-holders then have access to this money only for investments such as buying a home, starting a business, or paying tuition.

***Reasons to adopt an assets approach*:**

Very tangible results may arise from what might seem to be a simple change of vocabulary. There are three major reasons for using an assets model to think about the resources a community already has. First, the traditional "needs-based" approach teaches community residents to think of themselves as deficient, and hence as dependent upon some outside force (such as the government) for rescue. In contrast, the "assets" approach empowers neighborhood residents, encouraging them to become active in improving their own lives. Second, while outside funding may be needed in both cases, a needs model channels funding to professional service providers; an assets model targets funding to resources within the neighborhood. Third, in the midst of the uncertainty about the future of traditional welfare created by the devolution of much responsibility to the states, an assets approach may be the most realistic way for communities to pursue development, because it reduces their dependence on state and federal government initiatives.

The reason for focusing on asset *development* as opposed to income support is the belief that this approach shows much greater promise of helping individuals to remove themselves from poverty, rather than merely supporting them in poverty. Advocates of this approach suggest that lack of assets, not lack of income, is the largest factor in trapping individuals in poverty. They emphasize the importance of helping people to become (literally) stakeholders in their neighborhoods, giving them tangible assets to preserve, which may serve as an impetus for long-term planning and even for productive risk-taking.

***Challenges of the assets approach*:**

The degree to which an assets approach can transform a community may depend in part on factors outside the community itself. While community development organizations can undertake activities to build the skills of community residents and to find internal sources of support for new businesses, they cannot immunize communities against the effects of such macro-economic trends as the migration of jobs out of the cities. Rural communities, in particular, may find that they lack some of the basic assets — such as adequate roads and access to numerous local resources — which urban neighborhoods take for granted. Advocates of the assets approach recognize that resources from outside communities may be important to the success of community projects. Such resources, McKnight argues, are a legitimate part of a map of community assets, but they should be at the periphery of the map, invoked to support community-based activities, not at the center.

5. SEEING THE BIG PICTURE

***Elements of a complete picture*:**

Although community development focuses, by definition, on local projects, it benefits from an awareness of the larger context in which it works. There are three ways to think about this larger perspective. First, it includes an awareness of large-scale forces, such as a recession, for instance, or a change in welfare policy, which may have significant impacts on local communities. Second, it means thinking about how local community development activities may be able to affect the well-being of cities and even of the nation as a whole. Finally, a larger perspective means viewing the efforts of community development as extending over time, both looking to the past for lessons, and evaluating goals and current efforts with an eye to long-term as well as short-term effects.

***Reasons to develop a larger perspective*:**

There are three reasons to cultivate a perspective larger than that of the community and its immediate projects. First, the challenges and possibilities of community development are partially shaped by macroeconomic factors and political decisions. Communities that keep track of these developments can tailor their programs to suit changing conditions. For instance, understanding the ways in which national-level political developments (such as NAFTA, for instance) are likely to affect the local economy may guide communities in deciding whether to attempt to provide enough local jobs for everyone, or to focus on improving transportation to jobs outside the neighborhood. Furthermore, while there are some things a community may not be able to do much about (the fading of certain industries, or the movement of certain kinds of jobs overseas, for instance), in other areas, it may be best able to help itself by being an organized and aware political force, able to make bargains that further its interests.

Second, although much community development is fueled by an attachment to a particular community, in general those involved with community development would like their efforts to be part of an overall improvement of life in all neighborhoods. The aim is not to improve one community at the expense of its neighbors, but piece by piece to improve an entire city and country.

Finally, changing the focus occasionally from the immediate plans of the community to the question of what lies in the more distant future or of how the community wishes to relate to larger issues may prove very useful in finding ways to resolve immediate disagreements by putting these issues in a different light.

***The challenge of finding the right perspective*:**

Keeping a larger perspective in mind may be difficult given that the strength of community development lies in its intensive focus on and knowledge of a local neighborhood. Nor is there a clear consensus on the right way to understand the

relationship of small communities to their larger economic and political environments. This is an ideologically charged issue; some urge an attitude of cooperative problem-solving, while others, seeing the outside world as largely exploitative in its relations with their communities, urge a more isolationist approach. In either case, complete isolation is impossible, and a practice of thinking of their work in relation to the outside world can help community developers to adapt to changing circumstances, and perhaps to themselves affect larger-scale social or political changes.

6. WORKING COLLABORATIVELY

***Understanding collaboration*:**

Working collaboratively means sharing expertise, talents, and resources to pursue some common goal. Such collaboration can take many forms, from the most minimal, such as the provision of referrals between organizations, to a full-fledged collaboration in which representatives from different groups meet together to plan a coordinated strategy for reaching common objectives. Community development organizations often collaborate with local institutions such as churches, schools, local business and other community service organizations, or with groups outside the neighborhood such as city government, police, or sister organizations in other neighborhoods. Some community-organizing groups work to create collaboration around specific issues, building networks that may expand their goals in the future. Such collaborations may be formalized in written contracts, which spell out the shared goals and distinct responsibilities of the partners in collaboration.

***Reasons to collaborate*:**

Collaboration springs naturally out of looking at neighborhoods comprehensively and focusing on assets. A comprehensive view of neighborhood development points to the importance of developing a wide range of services and opportunities for neighborhood residents. This can pose quite a challenge to a small organization whose expertise may lie in only one or two areas, such as housing and community organizing. Organizations that think in terms of assets will be able to meet this challenge by identifying potential collaborators with complementary strengths. Collaborating organizations can concentrate on their own area(s) of expertise and conserve resources by avoiding duplication of services within a community. Collaboration can produce a level of comprehensiveness that no one organization could provide working as an isolated unit.

***Limits of Collaboration*:**

Making collaboration work is not easy. Organizations that wish to collaborate may find themselves hampered by differences in organizational culture, by a divergence in their goals, or by an unwillingness to cede "turf" (responsibility and control) to untried new allies. Effective collaboration demands a considerable investment of time in shared

planning and other forms of communication in order to build trust, establish shared goals, and manage or prevent potential turf battles. This time may be difficult to find for already overworked staff, presenting a serious challenge in the short run to organizations that are attempting to collaborate in order to maximize their long-term effectiveness.

7. BALANCING "PROCESS" AND "PRODUCT"

***The role of "process" and "product" in community development*:**

"Process" and "product" are two necessary elements of comprehensive community development. Community development organizations that pursue a comprehensive approach must balance "process," the attempt to build community in ways which empower residents to sustain progress over the long term, with the pressing need to produce visible short-term results, or "product." Process involves planning (especially long-term planning), community organizing, and the development of collaborative, democratic, and accountable systems of governance. Product, in contrast, can be represented concretely by newly built or renovated and well-managed buildings as well as other visible, successful events and programs, from expanded child care services to neighborhood barbecues and reclaimed parks. Successfully combining these two elements means integrating an ongoing, valued process of community organizing and governance with an effective, dynamic program for producing visible change in the community.

***The necessity of balancing process and product*:**

Neither process nor product can be sacrificed to the other. Community development organizations face a complex variant on the old adage, "Give a man a fish, feed him for a day; teach a man to fish, feed him for a lifetime." Certainly, these organizations aim to organize neighborhoods to lead their own community development efforts. This determination has been reinforced by the experiences of some community developers as property managers. Community development organizations have often found that physical improvements to buildings, unsustained by a sense of community involvement and empowerment, bring little lasting benefit. Through such process activities as organizing and collective governance, community members become committed stakeholders in community development projects. This kind of community involvement not only develops individual leadership, but it also helps community development efforts to find a better fit with the needs and interests of their neighborhoods.

At the same time, neglecting product entirely carries a heavy cost. Tangible, successful products are a good way to get communities interested in becoming part of community development efforts. In the long run, empowering neighborhoods by making resident involvement central to community development projects and developing local leadership is crucial to success, but in the short run, it is important to produce visible results in order to build trust and to stimulate residents' interest in participating in

community development. In the best case, community organizing can serve to help communities identify short-term projects on which they can make progress, while at the same time pursuing longer-term projects for community development.

***Challenges*:**

Finding a healthy balance between process and product is far from easy. It may be hard to get adequate funding for "process" activities such as community organizing, and the need to succeed with a product in a timely way may result in pressure to abbreviate process in the name of efficiency. Tuning governance structures to ensure a strong and diverse community voice while maintaining an efficient focus on results is a fine art, which may best be seen in the workings of successful organizations.

8. DRAWING ON MULTIPLE SOURCES OF FUNDING

***Distinctive features of comprehensive community development funding*:**

Comprehensive community development, pursuing as it does a wide range of activities, will rarely or never find one organization or government office to fund the whole range of comprehensive community development programs. Accordingly, practitioners of comprehensive community development typically construct a kind of funding mosaic, draw on a range of sources of funding, including the federal government, state and local governments, an array of local and national private foundations, and corporate sponsors. One interesting feature of community development is its ability to obtain funding from groups with a range of ideological and political orientations. The median successful community development organization in the Vidal study of 130 successful community development organizations (cited below under General Resources), for example, relied on six sources of funding. With the devolution of national welfare programs to the states, comprehensive community development efforts may well find themselves turning increasingly to local sources of funding.

***Why multiple funding sources can be helpful*:**

Multiple funding sources, in the best case, may promote flexibility for community development initiatives. Drawing on a range of funding sources is highly compatible with community development's comprehensive approach to neighborhood improvement. The financial support needed for the full range of community development activities, from community organizing to housing rehabilitation, is generally only available from a variety of sources, each of which might fund one part of the overall community development program. As a result, community development efforts may be able to be more comprehensive when they draw on a wide spectrum of funders. Having a range of sources of funding may also help to sustain a community's independence, preserving community control by protecting it from inordinate influence by any one sponsor.

Furthermore, a move to more local funding of community development projects may serve to improve the possibilities for dialogue with more accessible local funders.

***The challenges of multiple funding sources*:**

Cobbling together a budget from a wide range of sources makes fund raising itself a time-consuming and expensive activity. Different funders may have different or even conflicting expectations for what a community development organization should accomplish or set as its highest priorities. Furthermore, the complexity of funding may make it difficult for community developers to sustain programs over the long term, once their start-up grants expire. Some kinds of activities that produce less tangible benefits, such as community organizing or social service provision, may be especially difficult to fund. Accordingly, groups are particularly anxious to find funders who will commit funding for five to ten years in order to give programs a true opportunity to prove themselves.

♦♦♦♦

Although amplified in many ways by poverty, the challenge of building community in distressed neighborhoods is one faced by neighborhoods throughout the United States and, on a larger scale, by the national American community. The picture of comprehensive community development presented above and in the resources below suggest a promising way of thinking about how to build and rebuild communities that may be of value both in guiding local efforts and in framing the national discussion of how to strengthen the local and personal ties that seem to be necessary to the flourishing of national democracy.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL RESOURCES

Brown, Prudence. "Comprehensive Neighborhood-Based Initiatives." *Cityscape* 2, no.2 (May 1996): 161-176. This article summarizes the characteristics of comprehensive community initiatives, pointing to the prevalence of certain factors such as collaborating, negotiating the "tension between process and product," and building "social capital." She stresses the importance of developing good methods of evaluating these programs while they are experiencing a great deal of popularity.

Gardner, John W. *Building Community*. Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector, September 1991. This article argues that the modern world suffers from an overall loss of community strength. Gardner points to ten main features of strong communities: a balance between wholeness and diversity, shared values, community members who look after each other's interests, effective communication and active participation in community life, conscious celebration and reaffirmation of the identity of the community, constructive relations with the outside world, the cultivation of the young so that they will support the community, a sense of goals and direction, and institutions that allow for community maintenance.

Guerrero, Gloria. "Rural Community Development: Challenges and Opportunities." *NFG Reports*. 3 (Winter 1996): 1, 5-10. This article highlights the special importance and difficulties of comprehensive development in rural areas. Even more than urban communities, rural areas may lack some of the most basic infrastructure needed for successful development. Guerrero examines the problems posed by this from the point of view of a funder, emphasizing the importance of collaboration in designing programs which are able to pursue many related aspects of development simultaneously.

Husock, Howard. "Bringing Back the Settlement House." *Public Welfare*. Fall 1993: 16-25. Husock's article on the history of settlement houses is an argument for reviving their comprehensive approach to neighborhood problems. Husock traces the successes of turn-of-the-century settlement houses to the way they built connections among people by providing a range of services, not just poverty-related services targeted at "problem" subpopulations, but also youth and recreation services that provided a center for whole communities.

Leiterman, Mindy. *Building Community: A Report on Social Community Development Initiatives*. New York: Local Initiatives Support Corporation, 1993. This LISC report focuses on how CDC's build communities in ways that go beyond housing development. It is based on a survey of thirty housing-providing CDC's that simultaneously pursue successful social community development projects. In response to a clear need for increased social stability, Leiterman finds that CDC's have been taking on greater roles in "community building." Leiterman details a number of ways in which

housing-providing CDC's are well situated to fulfill this role — already rooted in the community, and with tangible successes behind them, they possess the credibility and connections to expand their activities into broader community building. The report argues that these efforts are promising but are hampered by funding difficulties as well as a lack of a way to share knowledge and experience. Leiterman suggests a role for LISC in providing funding and technical assistance, as well as facilitating communication about these efforts. The report includes six case studies of CDC's successfully engaged in social community development.

Miller, Maurice Lim. ***Long-Term Self-Sufficiency: A Practice-Based Anti-Poverty Analysis. Policy Brief.*** **San Francisco, CA: Asian Neighborhood Design. January 1996.** This article argues on behalf of taking a comprehensive approach to poverty relief that aims at developing self-sufficiency. It highlights the difficulties of working with the current fragmented system of service delivery, points to a number of areas of life that a comprehensive programs should address, and suggests methods for tracking and evaluating progress using a comprehensive approach.

Rubin, Herbert. "There Aren't Going to Be Any Bakeries Here If There Is No Money to Afford Jellyrolls: The Organic Theory of Community Based Development." ***Social Problems*** **41, no.3. (August 1994): 401-424.** Herbert Rubin's article, based on interviews with a range of CDC organizers, reveals that a "comprehensive" approach to problems allows them to address three issues simultaneously that are important to them: helping improve neighborhoods, helping individuals, and strengthening community power to address national and city-wide issues of economic and social policy.

Sommer, Teresa Eckrich, Prudence Brown, Robert J. Chaskin, Robert M. Goerge, Harold A. Richman, Lesley D. Slavitt, and Sudhir Venkatesh. ***Creation of a Community Information Infrastructure.*** **Chicago: The Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago, April 1996.** This paper outlines the structure of an ongoing Chapin Hall project to engage in a collaboration between researchers and community development organizations in taking a comprehensive inventory of communities that highlights interconnections between the "physical, cultural, social, economic, and service components" of neighborhood life and how these affect individuals.

Stone, Rebecca, ed. ***Core Issues in Comprehensive Community-Building Initiatives.*** **Chicago: Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago, February 1996.** In this collection of essays, Tim Hasci examines the problem of making a comprehensive approach work for both individuals and neighborhoods. Four responses, from an academic, a policy analyst, a foundation associate, and the president of a community development organization, point out different ways of thinking about this supposed dilemma.

Sullivan, Mercer L. ***More than Housing: How Community Development Corporations Go About Changing Lives and Neighborhoods.*** **New York: Community Development Research Center, Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy, New School for Social Research, 1993.** In this paper, Mercer Sullivan explains this comprehensive approach by investigating the intersection of CDC's property management, social services, and organizing activities. Many CDC's have had their principle tangible successes in the area of property development. However, as believers in a comprehensive approach, they must find a way to combine property management functions, which include rule enforcement and even sometimes eviction, with the provision of social services, which may include counseling tenants through unemployment or more serious problems such as drug dependency.

Sviridoff, Mitchell and William Ryan. ***Investing in Community: Lessons and Implications of the Comprehensive Community Revitalization Program.*** **January 1997.** This report examines the work of the Comprehensive Community Reinvestment Program (CCRP) with five community development organizations in the South Bronx. It looks at how the CCRP bridges the gap between the insights and concerns of those involved in human services and those involved in community development. Using the analogy of "venture capital," it stresses the importance of overarching community investment programs working with CDC's to help their projects to succeed, rather than simply providing funding and/or dictating programs. The report emphasizes the importance of organizational capacity, but suggests that this does not imply that all neighborhood programs need to be coordinated from above following a grand plan. Finally, following Robert Putnam, it emphasizes the benefits of building everyday civic networks and opportunities for civic engagement among all community members, contrasting this with two extremes of treating community members as passive clients and trying to engage them chiefly as policy makers.

United States General Accounting Office. ***Community Development: Comprehensive Approaches Address Multiple Needs but Are Challenging to Implement.*** **Washington, D.C., February 1995.** This government report uses a study of four CDC's pursuing a comprehensive approach to community development to explain 1) the reasons for adopting a comprehensive approach; 2) the special challenges produced by adopting a comprehensive approach; and 3) what the federal government can do to help. It concludes that the comprehensive approach to community development is very promising, but it faces serious challenges caused by difficulties in organizing local residents and by the need to adapt itself to the restraints of targeted funding. It suggests that consolidating federal programs might be useful.

Vidal, Avis C. ***Rebuilding Communities: A National Study of Urban Community Development Corporations. Executive Summary.*** **New York: Community Development Research Center, Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy, New School for Social Research, 1992.** This report summarizes the findings of a national study of 130 successful community development corporations, aimed at evaluating the potential of community-oriented economic development efforts to improve

poor neighborhoods on a national scale. It finds that community development is "ripe for expansion." In particular, economies of scale may be realized by investing more in relatively small CDC's, increasing the ratio of program money to core operating costs. Other interesting findings are that leadership stability is a strong predictor of output, as is working with a clearly defined strategy.

Walsh, Joan. Stories of Renewal: "Community Building and the Future of Urban America." New York: The Rockefeller Foundation. January 1997. This report provides a very clear overview of the community building movement. It uses five case studies of community building projects: the Chatham-Savannah Youth Futures Authority, the Comprehensive Community Revitalization Project in the South Bronx, the Atlanta Project, Baltimore's Community Building in Partnership, and Oakland's Urban Strategies Council. Each of these is used as a model in one of five areas: engaging with public systems like schools, welfare departments, and the criminal justice system; building local institutions; investing in outreach and organizing; involving the corporate sector; and developing new structures of governance and participation. The second half of the report highlights more general lessons about community-building, and includes a discussion of the importance of leadership and of facing racial issues openly and constructively.

RESOURCES FOR THE EIGHT THEMES IN COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

1. *Supporting Families*

Bruner, Charles. ***Realizing a Vision for Children, Families, and Neighborhoods: An Alternative to Other Modest Proposals.*** **Des Moines: National Center for Service Integration, 1996.** This policy paper argues that we know how to promote good outcomes for children, but that as a country we are making inadequate efforts to implement this knowledge. Bruner points to a number of disturbing indicators of declines in children's well-being over the last decade, and outlines a community-focused agenda for improving this situation.

Bruner, Charles, Frank Farrow, Bob Friedman, and John Gates. ***The Case for Kids: Community Strategies for Children and Families: Promoting Positive Outcomes.*** **Atlanta: The Carter Center, February 14-16 1996.** This collection of excerpts from the proceedings of a symposium on children and families includes four brief articles by Charles Bruner, Frank Farrow, Bob Friedman, and John Gates. The focus of the conference is on the potential and the political strategies for a national movement "to promote positive outcomes for children and families." Together, these papers make a case for more comprehensive, neighborhood-level programs to support children and families, addressing particular issues such as how to promote resiliency in children, how to create neighborhood networks of support for children and parents, and how to develop leadership skilled in taking a comprehensive approach to working with children and families.

Cohen, Elena, Theodora Ooms, and John Hutchins. "Comprehensive Community-Building Initiatives: A Strategy to Strengthen Family Capital. Background Briefing Report." Washington, D.C.: Family Impact Seminar, 1996. This report discusses how community development projects and family support programs might be able to work together to build "family capital." In parallel chapters, Cohen et al. trace the history of efforts in the areas of community development and family support, indicating the lessons that have been learned from each effort, investigating in detail the current state of affairs, and providing the reader with brief descriptions of current programs in each area. They suggest that community development programs and family support efforts have more or less simultaneously and independently come to realize the need to coordinate their work. However, cooperation is hindered because the two fields have developed different assumptions and languages for discussing their work. Cohen et al. suggest a dialogue centering on certain key issues: understanding the relationship between family and community, identifying family and community strengths and resources, choosing specific goals for the development of "family capital," sharing lessons about how to engage and empower families in the community, and discussing different methods of setting priorities.

Dombro, Amy Laura, Nina Sazer O'Donnell, Ellen Galinsky, Sarah Gilkeson Melcher, and Abby Farber. ***Community Mobilization: Strategies to Support Young Children and Their Families.*** **New York: Families and Work Institute, 1996.** This is a "how-to" volume aimed at helping people mobilize their communities to help children and families. The authors, basing their analysis on three years of interviews with community mobilization efforts, break up this process into three "stages": creating, implementing, and sustaining a community's "vision." For each stage, the authors sketch the general issues to be considered, and draw on successful efforts around the country for examples of how to go about this process. For those who want more information, the authors include a list of contacts of the organizations cited.

Dunst, Carl J. ***Key Characteristics and Features of Community-Based Family Support Programs.*** **Commissioned paper prepared for the Best Practices Project, Family Resource Coalition, Chicago, IL, November 1994.** This paper presents a definition of what "community-based family support programs" ought to be. While acknowledging that such programs can take a range of forms, Dunst identifies a number of features that he argues should distinguish such programs from traditional family services. In particular, these programs are described as taking an "ecological" approach to families — emphasizing the importance of understanding family function in the context of larger forces affecting members of the family, as well as the importance of community support for families to function well. They emphasize preventing problems rather than responding to crises, and engage with parents in ongoing development of their parenting skills. Such an approach suggests the importance of a more equal, collaborative relationship between families and programs. Dunst examines in some detail the kind of practices such programs will engage in, arguing for the importance of distinguishing between programs that meet these criteria and those which still follow an older model of professional services provided in response to family crises.

Farrow, Frank. ***System Change at the Neighborhood Level: Creating Better Futures for Children, Youth, and Families.*** **Center for the Study of Social Policy. Paper Prepared for the National Leadership Symposium on Community Strategies for Children and Families: Promoting Positive Outcomes, February 14-16, 1996.** This paper focuses on the importance of pursuing neighborhood-based family support, describes the characteristics of neighborhood-based "networks of support," and examines three examples of such networks in Los Angeles County, Louisville, KY, and Cedar Rapids, IA. Farrow identifies four key prerequisites for success: 1) the commitment of leaders in the public sector to delivering services on the neighborhood level; 2) flexible funding; 3) developing more well-rounded professionals; and 4) developing new and inclusive systems of neighborhood governance.

O'Donnell, Sandy and Ellen Schumer. "Community Building & Community Organizing: Issues in Creating Effective Models." ***Shelterforce*****, no. 85. (January/February 1996): 12-15.** In this article, Shumer and O'Donnell suggest that community organizing centered on families may successfully address many of the difficulties faced by organizers. The authors investigate a model of "family-focused

community building" as practiced by their organization, Community Organizing and Family Issues (COFI). This is a project that works with neighborhood parents training them how to translate their parenting skills into leadership in the community. COFI integrates organizing and family services in range of ways. They look for recruits to their programs at local institutions such as schools and child care centers that serve families. The content of their training emphasizes continuities and connections between family and community life, working to involve families in making the community a better place for families. Finally, they cultivate a broad definition of leadership, which runs from local service to involvement in city or state policymaking.

Stokley, Jan. ***Community Renewal of Family Economic Security: The Emerging Role of California's Family Support Programs in Community Economic Development.*** **National Economic Development and Law Center, October 1996.** This is a study of ways in which family support programs in California are moving toward an interest in community economic development. In the context of the economic downturn that California has undergone in recent years, the report finds that family support programs in California have been motivated by their ecological perspective to expand their roles or undertake collaborations in the area of economic development. It provides a number of recommendations as to how such expansion and collaboration can best be pursued in the context of a devolution of federal power to local levels.

Weiss, Heather and Robert Halpern. ***Community-Based Family Support and Education Programs: Something Old or Something New?*** **New York: The National Center for Children in Poverty, 1991.** This paper provides an overview of community-based family support and education programs and their history, suggests some guidelines for such programs, and suggests some focuses for evaluation efforts and state policies. Weiss and Halpern emphasize the importance of program balance between supporting parents and children and uncritical nurturance of families and guidance toward better parenting. They also stress flexibility, reliability, and realistic expectations.

Wynn, Joan, Joan Costello, Robert Halpern, and Harold Richman. ***Children, Families, and Communities: A New Approach to Social Services.*** **Chicago: The Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago, 1994.** This report argues for a new way of thinking about providing services to children and families. Conceptually, it suggests a division of services into two categories: "primary services," or community resources, such as child care, which are available in local neighborhoods, and "specialized services," which represents more professional services provided by sources such as welfare agencies. This way of thinking is meant to assert the importance of primary services. The report goes on to discuss how primary services can be enhanced, how cooperation between primary and specialized services can be achieved, and how this process can be put in the hands of communities.

Wynn, Joan R., Sheila M. Merry, and Patricia G. Berg. ***Children, Families, and Communities: Early Lessons from a New Approach to Social Services.*** **Washington, D.C.: American Youth Policy Forum et al., 1995.** This paper gives a progress report on the first four years of the ten-year Children, Youth, and Families Initiative sponsored by the Chicago Community Trust. It describes the first efforts of the initiative, and points to preliminary lessons on issues of governance, participation, staffing, collaboration, and providing services. It also discusses the roles played by sponsors and evaluators in this project.

2. *Focusing on Youth*

McLaughlin, Milbrey W., Merita A. Irby, and Juliet Langman. ***Urban Sanctuaries: Neighborhood Organizations in the Lives and Futures of Inner-City Youth.*** **San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1994.** By examining six organizations that have succeeded in attracting and benefiting youth, this book focuses on what makes a program for youth successful. The book argues that programs for youth can indeed work and identifies a number of characteristics of successful programs, such as a dedicated leader, consistent rules, valued activities, and a local orientation.

Sipe, Cynthia L. ***Mentoring: A Synthesis of P/PV's Research: 1988-1995.*** **Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures, Fall 1996.** This report summarizes the findings of seven years of research on the effectiveness of mentoring youth. It concludes that well-run mentoring can effectively benefit youth and goes on to discuss the characteristics of effective mentoring relationships.

Sullivan, Mercer. (cited above). In his report on community development, Mercer Sullivan reports that services for children and youth are particularly important supplements to the "bricks and mortar" side of community development. Sullivan points out that children and youth are some of the segments of the community whose lives are most centered on their immediate neighborhood. Unsupervised children, or youth without sufficient opportunities for constructive activities may become problems for communities. Among community development organizations visited, many that did not have services for children and youth saw this as the most significant gap in their programming.

3. *Building Unity from Diversity*

Building Strong Communities. **(cited above).** Peter Edelman examines the issue of diversity from a number of angles. In particular, Edelman and his fellow discussants ask how middle-class suburban America can best be motivated to take steps for the improvement of urban communities.

Chang, Hedy Nai-Lin, Denise De La Rosa Salazar and Cecelia Leong. ***Drawing Strength from Diversity: Effective Services for Children, Youth and Families.*** **California Tomorrow, 1994.** This report by the California Tomorrow organization draws on research that includes on-site visits to seven California programs and a survey of almost one hundred programs. It investigates how institutions that serve children, youth, and families should respond to the increasing diversity of many American neighborhoods, arguing that an improved focus on diversity is essential to the success of family services. Effectively involving community members as stakeholders in projects may require overcoming barriers of language, culture, and trust that may otherwise make full community participation impossible. The report stresses the importance of being able to work in languages other than English and of understanding and respecting different cultural norms and practices. The authors present a range of suggestions on other issues, including how to conduct a useful community assessment, how to develop a staff capable of working effectively with diverse populations, and how to make institutional changes that will encourage more effective responses to diversity.

Dewar, Tom. ***Hunting for Hope: Themes, Dilemmas, and Opportunities in Community Development: A Background Paper.*** **Rainbow Research, Inc., June 30, 1993.** This paper presents a brief survey of the new emphasis on neighborhoods associated with community development. It characterizes the aims of neighborhood-focused development as threefold: to develop community political and economic power, to preserve and celebrate diverse cultures, and to produce greater efficiency and flexibility in administration. Dewar examines the relationship of the ideas of "neighborhood" and "community," suggesting that ties of community, which imply some greater shared interest than simply proximity of residence, must be utilized or created to make community development successful. He raises a number of issues for and lessons from neighborhood initiatives. The difficulties center on problems of managing diversity within communities, problems of motivating residents to engage in collective action, and structural problems of providing forums for action and the necessary skills to manage conflict and further cooperation. Among lessons learned, Dewar points to the importance for community development of focusing on long-term results, building relationships (both with leaders and members), and balancing a growing sense of "ownership" among longstanding participants with a maintenance of "openness" to new points of view.

4. *Thinking in Terms of Assets*

Assets: A Quarterly Update for Innovators. **Published by the Corporation for Enterprise Development as part of the Assets & Enterprise Welfare Reform Initiative funded by the Joyce and Charles Stewart Mott Foundations.** This quarterly newsletter covers national and local news relevant to assets formation programs, as well as highlighting the efforts of practitioners in a number of communities and new resources available to those interested in promoting asset development.

CDC's and the Future of American Communities: Shelterforce. **"Transforming Communities," no. 83 (Sept/Oct 1995).** In this article, five practitioners and observers of community development share their experiences with community development, with particular emphasis on how these relate to the ideas of Kretzmann and McKnight.

Cohen, Elena, Theodora Ooms, and John Hutchins. ***Comprehensive Community-Building Initiatives: A Strategy to Strengthen Family Capital. Background Briefing Report.*** **Washington, D.C.: Family Impact Seminar, 1996.** This report discusses the challenges and opportunities of partnerships between state social service providers and those active in local community development. While recognizing the potential for ideological conflict between these two groups, they point hopefully to a growing recognition on both sides of the need to work together, and make some suggestions for improving dialogue on key issues.

Grossman, Brian. ***Designing Your Own Individual Development Account Demonstration: An Information and Resource Handbook for Community-Based Organizations.*** **New Revised Edition. Washington, D.C: Corporation for Enterprise Development.** This handbook includes information about IDA accounts, as well as examples of IDA programs, a list of resources, and sample forms, resources, and curriculum outlines.

Kretzmann, John P. and John L. McKnight. ***Building Communities From the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets.*** **Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research Neighborhood Innovations Network, Northwestern University. Chicago: ACTA Publications, 1993.** This workbook is a comprehensive guide to the theory and practice of assets-based community development by two central figures in the field. It includes a great deal of practical, specific advice on how to translate the idea of "assets-focused development" into practice in individual communities. For those who wish to find out more about their programs, the authors provide a list of contacts within the organizations they discuss.

Mayer, Steven E. "The Assets Model of Community Development: Remarks Made at the Conference 'Maximizing Returns on Community Investment.'" Rainbow Research, Inc., no date. In this speech delivered to an audience of community-development funders, Mayer makes the case for allocating funding based on an "assets" model in community development. .He contrasts this approach with the pervasive "needs-based" model, which views the poor as dependent clients of big programs. Such a model, Mayer argues, hampers community building by teaching residents to think of themselves as helpless and with little to offer in solving their own problems.

Oliver, Melvin L. and Thomas M. Shapiro. ***Black Wealth / White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality.*** **New York: Routledge, 1995.** This book raises and seeks to answer the question of why there is such a disparity between whites and blacks in America in the ownership of wealth. The authors suggest that wealth (or total assets, as opposed to income) is an important and understudied dimension of racial inequality.

They trace its roots in history, and argue that wealth inequalities limit the opportunities of blacks in highly significant ways. Their analysis points to the importance of changing current government policies, such as welfare, to make them more friendly to asset-formation, as well as finding other ways to remove barriers to asset formation related to education, housing, and business.

Porter, Michael E. "The Competitive Advantage of the Inner City." ***Harvard Business Review.*** **(May-June 1995): 55-71.** This article argues that the true advantages of doing business in the inner city are not sufficiently appreciated. In particular, Porter points to "strategic location, local market demand, integration with regional clusters, and human resources" as potential advantages of inner-city locations for the right businesses. While acknowledging some drawbacks for such a location, Porter argues that the inner city has a great deal to offer appropriate businesses, which could benefit from this location even without special government subsidies.

Sherraden, Michael. ***Assets and the Poor: A New American Welfare Policy.*** **Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 1991.** This book investigates the welfare system and argues that the key to real improvements in the problem of poverty in the United States lies in shifting the focus of welfare away from income maintenance and towards building assets for the poor. Sherraden suggests that implementing a welfare program using individual development accounts in addition to some income transfers would have a permanent and positive impact on the problems of poverty in the United States.

5. *Seeing the Big Picture*

Building Strong Communities: Crafting a Legislative Foundation. **Washington, D.C.: The Finance Project, December 1996.** This "legislative toolkit" is intended to be a practical aid to state and local legislators in drafting legislation to support community development in the context of federal welfare reform. It includes sample legislation and guidelines for tailoring this sample to particular local circumstances, as well as an analysis of current laws and a guide to further resources.

Building Strong Communities: Strategies for Urban Change. **(cited above).** Ronald Shiffman's paper and the accompanying discussion focuses particularly on how the process of "visioning," or community planning with the larger perspective in mind can work to promote community and city development. Audrey Rowe presents a paper and leads a discussion that examines the implication of the shifting of responsibility for social services from the federal government to the states for community services. The discussion addresses the question of how state programs can best be structured to encourage and utilize the collaboration of the community in the provision of family services.

Kahn and Kamerman. (cited above). An essay by Robert Halpern puts neighborhood development in historical perspective. Essays by William Morrill and by Fred Wulczyn each address the question of how small-scale projects might be expanded to address the problems of whole cities. Ester Fuchs and J. Phillip Thompson investigate the problems cities face in attempting to win federal and state support.

Nowak, Jeremy. "Neighborhood Initiative and the Regional Economy." ***Economic Development Quarterly.*** **11 (February 1997): 3-10.** This article argues that a too-narrow focus on small-scale communities in development may not be the best approach to alleviating poverty. Drawing in part upon the community development experiences of the Delaware Valley Community Reinvestment Fund (of which Nowak is the executive director) the author argues that the limits that regional economic problems put upon community development are real and very important. At worst, community development strategies that attempt to preserve neighborhoods by building housing and providing services to neighborhoods with no access to viable sources of employment risk discouraging necessary mobility and increasing the concentration of the poor in depressed areas. Nowak urges the importance of balancing an emphasis on community with a focus on regional development, on connecting the local labor market with jobs inside or outside neighborhoods of residence, and on developing individual and family assets.

Sidor, John and Linda Wolfe. ***Linking Housing and Human Services: Taking the Next Steps: Policy Recommendations.*** **Washington, D.C.: Council of State Community Development Agencies and American Public Welfare Association, July 1992.** This report examines how federal and state government policies might be modified to encourage state efforts to link the provision of housing and social services.

Stone, ed. (cited above). William Mollard's essay, "Community Building and the Economic Context," examines some recent macroeconomic trends, such as the move of much development to the suburbs, the growth of high-tech and service jobs, and the simultaneous decline of manufacturing, and discusses how an understanding of these trends might shape community development policy. Respondents from government, academia, and community development organizations present a range of views, from an emphasis on the need to focus on connecting with outside jobs, to an emphasis on the need to understand the political dimensions of what have been presented as purely economic events.

6. *Working Collaboratively*

Bilchik, Shay. ***Matrix of Community-Based Initiatives: Program Summary.*** **U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1995.** This government report identifies an array of large-scale programs (both government and private sector) that address either violence prevention or economic development. It briefly describes each program, and provides a reference to contact for further information. It concludes with a chart that shows which of these programs are currently operating in large to mid-sized cities around the country.

Building Strong Communities: Strategies for Urban Change. Conference Report. **Sponsored by the Annie E. Casey, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations. Cleveland, May 13-15, 1992.** This report includes five papers on community development, along with summaries of the discussion that occurred when the papers were presented. The session led by Ralph Smith of the Philadelphia Children's Network discusses how to promote "community-responsive schools."

Calfee, Carol and Frank Wittwer. ***Building a Full Service School: Florida's Model of Collaboration for School-based and School-linked Services.*** **Tallahassee: The Florida Department of Education, 1995.** This "guidebook" is designed to help communities think about building full-service schools. It examines different models of full-service schools, discusses the planning and community needs-assessment process, and provides guidance on obtaining funding. It includes a number of extremely practical aids, such as community needs-assessment surveys and sample school floorplans. It ends with an extensive annotated bibliography of sources related to school-linked services.

Cronin, Roberta C. ***Innovative Community Partnerships: Working Together for Change: Program Summary.*** **U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, May 1996.** This government report describes three initiatives focused on collaborations between service providers and police. They draw lessons from their analysisand point to persistent challenges.

Kahn, Alfred J. and Sheila B. Kamerman. ***Children and their Families in Big Cities: Strategies for Service Reform.*** **New York: Cross-National Studies Research Program, Columbia University School of Social Work, 1996.** This volume is a collection of essays directed at the question of how new forms of service provision can be used to improve the environment for children and their families in big cities. Two papers ("The Community Base for New Service Delivery Strategies" by Richman, Brown and Venkatesh, and "The Path of Most Resistance: Lessons Learned from 'New Futures' by Nelson) are particularly relevant to the question of the challenges of collaboration. The first examines the wisdom of coordinating services through one "lead" agency, as opposed to a coordination that elevates no one agency to a central position; the second gives an analysis of the difficulties faced by a foundation project that aimed to take a comprehensive approach to working with urban youth.

Kubisch, Anne C. "Comprehensive Community Initiatives." ***Shelterforce*** **85 (January/February 1996).** In this article, Kubisch highlights a number of issues faced by those intent on developing a comprehensive approach to neighborhood development. In particular, she focuses on some of the challenges of collaboration. Collaboration makes heavy demands for time and effort on the part of participating organizations. The alternative, however, to start a new organization from scratch, is very costly.

Loury, Glenn C. and Linda Datcher-Loury. "Not by Bread Alone: The Role of the African-American Church in Inner-City Development." The Brookings Review (Winter 1997): 10-13. The authors of this short article argue that churches are uniquely capable of addressing issues of morality and of behavioral change in ways that other groups that contact inner-city residents are not.

Morse, Suzanne W. ***Building Collaborative Communities: Leadership Collaboration Series.*** **Tonya M. Yoder, ed. Pew Partnership for Civic Change, 1996.** This pamphlet argues for the importance of collaboration within communities, and takes up the question of the difficulties of collaboration and how to make attempts at collaboration successful. It includes references to and summaries of a number of other works that have analyzed the elements of successful collaboration.

Sadd, Susan and Randolph M. Grinc. "Implementation Challenges in Community Policing: Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing in Eight Cities." ***National Institute of Justice Research in Brief,*** **February 1996.** This paper summarizes the findings of a National Institute of Justice study of eight neighborhood policing programs. It found that the most serious obstacle to success lies in police resistance to this new approach, as well as in community fear of retaliation for cooperation with police.

7. *Balancing Process and Product*

Building Strong Communities. **(cited above).** An essay by Ronald Shiffman is included in this work, along with a discussion in which community development practitioners focus on the ways in which they have been able to promote effective community planning.

Chaskin, Robert J. and Sunil Garg. ***The Issue of Governance in Neighborhood-Based Initiatives.*** **Chicago: The Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago, December 1994.** Chaskin investigates how five comprehensive community development initiatives engage in community governance and relate their structures of governance to local politics.

Dewar, Tom. "Some Dilemmas in Doing Good in Community Development." ***Partner*** **(Winter 1987).** This article makes a strong case for the importance of process. In particular, Dewar emphasizes the sacrifices of long-term community empowerment that may occur when too much emphasis and importance is attached to management, to staff, to "leadership training" and to economic development.

Stone, Rebecca, ed. (cited above). Essays by Chaskin and Garg and by Mark Joseph and Renae Ogletree address approaches to governance and community organizing. Community organizers and other experts in the field respond to these essays, providing a range of views of these issues.

Traynor, William. "Community Building: Hope and Caution." ***Shelterforce*** **83 (September/October 1995):12-16.** This article discusses the challenges of process faced by comprehensive community-building initiatives, particularly funding, planning, building resident involvement, and making internal organizational changes to accommodate a new emphasis on community organizing and participation. Traynor includes practical suggestions on how to meet these challenges, along with references to further resources.

U.S. Department of Justice. "Communities: Mobilizing Against Crime Making Partnerships Work." ***National Institute of Justice Journal,*** **no. 231 (August 1996).** This issue of the National Institute of Justice Journal is devoted to the question of how police can collaborate with communities. It examines programs run by the Office of Justice, as well as local community programs that promote collaboration in crime prevention.

8. *Drawing on Multiple Sources of Funding*

Building Strong Communities. **(cited above).** This report concludes with a discussion with foundation representatives about their goals and their relationships with grant recipients. Discussion focuses on how foundations might respond to an increased emphasis on flexibility and community involvement in program planning and examines the typical foundation approach of fostering small-scale projects rather than attempting to pursue national-level reforms directly.

Orland, Martin E., Anna E. Danegger, and Ellen Foley. ***Creating More Comprehensive, Community-Based Support Systems: The Critical Role of Finance.*** **Washington, D.C.: The Finance Project, November 1995.** This report criticizes the current system of financing programs for children and families, arguing that it promotes inefficient fragmentation and makes it difficult to develop a community-based system of family support. The authors describe the current state of funding and call for changes that will promote the funding of services that cross traditional divisions between service

sectors (such as health and education), greater control for local communities in allocating resources, and a revised training of professionals to make them more responsive to communities.

Rice, Jennifer King. ***Conceptualizing the Costs of Comprehensive, Community-based Support Systems for Children.*** **Washington, D.C.: The Finance Project, November 1995.** This paper, intended to serve as a tool for policymakers, presents a "template" for estimating the costs of implementing comprehensive support programs for children within communities. In addition to a theoretical explanation, it includes a model application of this template to estimating the cost of implementing a comprehensive community-based support model in a sample community.

Stone, ed. (cited above). An essay by Stephen Baker, Robert Chaskin, and Joan Wynn examines the relationship between sponsors and community development organizations. It points out the tension that may emerge between what is generally a shared ideal of community control and the reality of the power that sponsors hold, as well as the constraints sponsors face as a result of the pressures upon them to produce visible results. Respondents active in community development and sponsoring organizations suggest ways in which this tension may be negotiable and resolvable.